



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/830,438	12/03/2001	Brian Milgate	45108/DBP	8030
23363	7590	09/01/2004	EXAMINER	
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP PO BOX 7068 PASADENA, CA 91109-7068			LILLING, HERBERT J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1651	

DATE MAILED: 09/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/830,438	MILGATE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	HERBERT J LILLING	1651	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>5</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

THIS IS A RESPONSE TO ATTORNEY INDICATION THAT THE PETITION LETTER DID NOT INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING OFFICE ACTION:

1. Receipt is acknowledged of the prior art information disclosure statement and the preliminary amendment filed December 03, 2001.

2. Claims 1-21 are pending in this application.

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 16-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claims are directed to non-statutory subject matter.

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention with respect to the extract per se.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 1651

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention with respect to the "extract".

The language of the claims must make it clear what subject matter the claims encompass to adequately delineate their "metes and bounds" for the claimed "extract(s)". See, e.g., the following decisions: In re Hammack, 427 F 2d. 1378, 1382, 166 USPQ 204, 208 (CCPA 1970); In re Venezia 530 F 2d. 956, 958, 189 USPQ 149, 151 (CCPA 1976); In re Goffe, 526 F 2d. 1393, 1397, 188 USPQ 131, 135 (CCPA 1975); In re Watson, 517 F 2d. 465, 477, 186 USPQ 11, 20 (CCPA 1975); In re Knowlton 481 F 2d. 1357, 1366, 178 USPQ 486, 492 (CCPA 1973). The courts have also indicated that before claimed subject matter can properly be compared to the prior art, it is essential to know what the claims do in fact cover. See, e.g., the following decisions: In re Steele, 305 F 2d. 859, 134 USPQ 292 (CCPA 1962); In re Moore 439 F 2d. 1232, 169 USPQ 236 (CCPA 1969); In re Merat, 519 F 2d. 1390, 186 USPQ 471 (CCPA 1975).

As indicated above, the courts have also indicated that before claimed subject matter can properly be compared to the prior art, it is essential to know what the claims do in fact cover since the "extract" ingredient(s) is/(not) in the claimed subject nor does the specification support the claimed subject matter to perform a search and examination for the claimed subject matter.

The enablement as well as the written description of the instant specification lack support for the claimed ingredients which may render the instant application fatally defective absent a showing to the contrary.

The specification lacks adequate written description for the claimed inventions in view of the following points in accordance with the written description requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The description must clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize what is claimed. Thus, an applicant must comply with the written description requirement "by describing the invention, with all its claimed limitations, not that which makes it obvious," and by using "such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, formulas, etc., that set forth the claimed invention." Lockwood, 107 F.3d at 1572, 41 USPQ2d at 1966.

An adequate written description of the ingredients requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method for isolating it.

The description requirement of the patent statute requires a description of an invention, not an indication of a result that one might achieve if one made that invention. See *In re Wilder*, 736 F.2d 1516, 1521, 222 USPQ 369, 372- 73 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Accordingly, naming a type of material generally known to exist, in the absence of knowledge as to what that material consists of, that is the "extract", is not a description of that material.

Thus, Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The claims lack sufficient description to inform a skilled artisan that applicant was in possession of the claimed invention at the time of filing since the specification lacks a complete structure or identifying characteristics, thus the description requirement has not been satisfied.

Claims 1-21 fail to comply with the above decisions.

Claims 2, 3, 11 and 12 are rejected for the expression "preferably" and "most preferably".

A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claims recites abroad recitation, and the claim also recites a narrower statement of the range/limitation.

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the best mode contemplated by the inventor has not been disclosed since the specification lacks any indication how and what the ingredients are within the scope of the claimed extract. As indicated above, this specification may be considered to be fatally defective absent

Art Unit: 1651


the method for the preparation and the ingredients that are within the scope of the extract. Any amendment to the specification or claims may be considered to be new matter and will not be entered.

5. No proper search and examination can be prepared in view of the fact that the "extract" component(s) has (have) not been submitted in the specification. If Applicant is enabled to correct the above deficiencies, a search on the merits will be made.

6. **No claim is allowed.**

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Examiner Lilling whose telephone number is 571-272-0918 and Fax Number is (703) 872-9306** or SPE Michael Wityshyn whose telephone number is 571-272-0926. Examiner can be reached Monday-Thursday from about 5:30 A.M. to about 3:00 P.M. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

H.J.Lilling: HJL
(703) 308-2034
Art Unit **1651**
August 30, 2004



Dr. Herbert J. Lilling
Primary Examiner
Group 1600 Art Unit 1651